REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18 and 22 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-22 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-15, 17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0176489 to Sriram et al. (hereinafter "Sriram"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to buffering methods and systems. As described in the specification, while conventional buffering methods are based on a clock signal from a master time, embodiments of the present invention allow a processor to not be synchronously clocked by the sample rate. In this regard, the processor is allowed to obtain data from sample buffers as needed. In accordance with embodiments of the present invention, a buffer is inputted conditional on the next buffer being inputted, as recited in the pending claims. For example, claim 1 recites "receiving samples at a third buffer during the processing of the first group of symbols." Independent claims 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22 each recite a similar feature.

By contrast, Sriram fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of the pending claims. In accordance with the disclosure of Sriram, the stated purpose of the input to the buffers is to detect time changes for the correlator. As noted above, in accordance with embodiments of the present invention, the buffers allow a processor to not be synchronously clocked by the sample rate.

Further, while embodiments of the present invention provide that the previous buffer is inputted conditional on the next buffer being inputted, Sriram fails to teach or suggest that a specific buffer input is pointed to with each group of sample inputs. Instead, the cited portions of Sriram merely disclose the availability of two buffers, but fail to specify any order or explicit instruction to which the buffers must be utilized.

The Examiner has argued that "a group of samples could still be received if nothing is received a t the previously mentioned buffer." Office Action dated March 21, 2008, Page 3. The Examiner further suggested wording for the relevant passage to more explicitly recite this feature. Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18 and 22 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Support for the amended language may be found in the originally filed specification and drawings. No new matter is introduced.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22 are patentable. Claims 2-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14-15 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claims 1, 10 or 13 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Claims 5, 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sriram in view of various other references. Claims 5, 8 and 16 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claims 1 or 13 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sriram in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0038633 to Robertson et al. (hereinafter "Robertson"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 18 recites features similar to those noted above with reference to independent claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17 and 22. Claim 18 is patentable for similar reasons as those noted above. Claims 19-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim

18 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5 December 2008          By    /G. Peter Albert, Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP          G. Peter Albert Jr.
Customer Number: 30542          Attorney for Applicant
Telephone:    (858) 847-6735          Registration No. 37,268
Facsimile:    (858) 792-6773